DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 985 RC 009 567

AUTHOR Gill, Tiiti; Gill, Howard
TITLE New Zealand: A Non-Traditional Rural Society.
PUB DATE Aug 76
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the World Congress of Rural Sociology (4th, Torun, Poland, August 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Comparative Analysis; Economic Factors; Females; Foreign Countries; Income; Life Style; Males; *Rural Areas; *Rural Urban Differences; Social Differences; *Social Stratification; *Surveys; *Synthesis
IDENTIFIERS *New Zealand; *World Congress of Rural Sociology (4th)

ABSTRACT

As a whole, rural New Zealanders are not deprived relative to the urban population, but the differences within New Zealand's rural population are as great if not greater than those among the urban population. A summary of studies on the pattern of social stratification reveals: (1) there is little tradition in New Zealand of separation of land ownership from farm operation with proprietorship being four times greater in the countryside; (2) agriculture dominates male employment in rural areas and in both urban and rural areas about 55% of the male workforce is manually employed; (3) 1971 census information on Canterbury Province shows the mean male income to be similar in rural and urban areas, though the spread of income level is greater in the country; (4) the educational level attained by rural residents compares favorably to that of urban residents; (5) a North Canterbury survey of female views on rural life indicates satisfaction among the majority with rural residence, increased satisfaction with distance from town, a higher preference for rural location among the entrepreneurial than the manual group (groups based on reference to husband's occupation), little influence of rural "disadvantages" on the preference for rural residence, and differences between the entrepreneurial and manual groups' perceptions of rural residence benefits and sense of "community". (JC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED131985

V

NEW ZEALAND

A NON-TRADITIONAL RURAL SOCIETY

A paper given to the Fourth World Congress of Rural Sociology

Torun, Poland

August 1976

Tiiti Gill
University of Canterbury
New Zealand

Howard Gill
Lincoln College
New Zealand

Seminar II: The future of rural communities in industrialized societies

RC009567

The urban and rural parts of New Zealand share a common and short political and economic history. Unlike in Europe and North America it is impossible to delineate a prior 'rural epoch' and a subsequent 'urban' one. The towns of New Zealand did not draw upon an established rural and agricultural population; rather rural and urban, agriculture and industry, were contemporaneous. New Zealand, as an affluent society, is an exception to the general pattern of economic development based on manufacturing industry. For the greater part of its European history national economic policy has favoured the development of farming, rather than that of manufacturing. Improved agricultural productivity has been more a means of increasing food production for export than one of reducing the farm labour force and allowing its transfer to manufacturing. The export earnings of primary production have been used to import capital goods and semi-finished goods that support urban industry.

In recent years the size of the rural population has decreased; so too has its relative economic position. As will be discussed this has led to substantial economic and non-economic concern stemming from an implicit assumption that rural depopulation is a 'bad' thing. There is an inadvertent concentration on the people leaving rural areas and hence avoidance of the actions of the majority, who remain. It is more realistic to consider the situation of rural people within the social, economic and cultural inter-action of the rural and urban parts of New Zealand. The source of any differentiation that now exists between rural and urban must be sought in their common history.

The development of European Settlement

Legend has it that Aotearoa was the creation of the Maori voyager Kupe who divided the great fish of Maui into the two main islands. The legend continues that the great Maori fleet arrived from Hawaiki in the 14th Century A.D. with each canoe carrying the ancestors of the present tribes. More prosaically it is thought that successive groups of Polynesians arrived in New Zealand from the 8th Century A.D. onwards. Which-ever account one accepts the Maori people had established a distinctive and very successful society and culture in New Zealand, especially in the North Island by the 18 th and 19th Centuries.

The first European contact was made by Tasman in 1692; in 1769 Cook circumnavigated and mapped the two main islands. Europeans and North Americans established whaling and sealing stations in the 1790's; by the late 1830's there was a European population of some 2,000 persons with the main centre at Kororareka in the Bay of Islands, Northland.

In 1840 New Zealand became a colony of Britain when, under the Treaty of Waitangi the Maori Chiefs ceded their sovreignity, but not their land, to the British Crown. In 1852 the Colony was granted responsible self-government; until 1876 this was based on Provincial Institutions, from that date there has been a central government and parliament.

Organised European settlement commenced in 1840 with the Port Nicholson (Wellington) settlement of the New Zealand Company. By 1848 it is estimated that the New Zealand Company had brough 10,000 persons to the country. In 1848 and 1850 settlements were established in Otago

and Canterbury by the New Zealand Company in conjunction with the Free Church of Scotland and the Church of England respectively. In 1854 the European population was estimated at 32,500, by 1866, stimulated by the Otago gold-rushes it had reached around 200,000. The population was increased with assisted migration in the 1870's and by 1908 the European population reached one million.

The European society of New Zealand has existed for a little over 100 years. In the early stages of this farming very rapidly became the perogative of the 'squatter' who achieved the control of large areas of rural land leased from the Crown. These large scale graziers were predominant in areas such as the Canterbury Plain, the Wairarapa, and Hawkes Bay. The peak of the large estates occurred in the early 1890's; in 1891 337 farms over 10,000 acres (4,000 hectare) occuppied 40% of all farm land. These farms represented 0.7% of all holdings. 230 of these 337 holdings operated on freehold, that is privately owned, land; furthermore 31% of the freehold land was owned by companies rather than private individuals. (see Gould 1970 for discussion)

Closer settlement on smaller units occurred in the North Island, particularly on land confiscated from the Maori. Official policies from the 1890's ownwards have been concerned with closer settlement and this has included the purchase and sub-division of large holdings, especially those in lowland areas. Opinion is divided, however, as to the extent to which the reduction in the large estates is due to state action, and the extent to which it stemmed from the development of dairying and from market forces. The concern with closer settlement underlies an emphasis on 'family farms' which has continued to the present day. As will be shown, this is not necessarily congruent with equality of land ownership.

Rural and Urban in New Zealand

New Zealand contrasts with other nations of the developed and affluent world. It's material prosperity is based on the export of agricultural goods, in particular the pastoral [illegible] produce, meat, wool and dairy products. These contribute 90% by value of the total exports of a nation with one of the highest per capita export levels. Despite this seeming dominace of agriculture New Zealand is one of the most urbanised countries in the world with a relatively small part of national income accruing to agriculturalists. The comparison is shown in table 1.

TABLE 1

Country	Date	% pop. rural	% primary work-force	% G.D.P. to agric	G.N.P. per capita
Australia	1966	16.6	8.9	9	2,629
Canada	1966	25.8	12.0	4	3,246
Denmark	1965	56.0	17.5	8	2,898
Finland	1970	49.1	23.3	12	1,963
Ireland	1966	50.8	31.1	14	1,246
Israel	1967	17.8	11.5	5	1,636
Japan	1965	31.9	14.9	7	1,658
Netherlands	1971	22.1	10.7	7	2,211
New Zealand	1971	18.5	14.1	10	2,019
Norway	1971	22.1	19.5	6	2,538
Poland	1970	47.7	32.3	17	
Sweden	1965	22.6	10.0	4	3,730
United Kingdom	1971	22.2	4.2	3	1,986
U.S.A.	1970	26.5	5.1	3	4,294
U.S.S.R.	1970	43.7		22	
Yugoslavia	1971	61.4	65.0		

(source; United Nations Demographic Statistics & Statistical Yearbook)

notes; 1. There is no consistency between countries as to the definition of rural.
2. The % of the population living in rural areas & the % of the work-force in primary industry (which is not solely agriculture) is for the census date.
3. The gross domestic product and gross national product figures are for 1970 or nearest available year.
4. GNP/capita expressed in $ U.S.

Table 1, despite the inconsistencies of definition shows that while New Zealand may be regarded as an agricultural nation it does not have an agricultural population. Historical information shows that from at least 1881 there has not been a majority of economically active population of New Zealand employed in the primary sector. Table 3 shows that at the turn of the 20th Century agriculture was less important as a direct source of livelihood in New Zealand than in many other countries.

TABLE 3

The proportion of the economically active population in agriculture in various countries and at various dates

France	1896	44%	Germany	1882	48%	Sweden	1877	83%
	1906	40%		1907	35%		1910	50%
	1913	38%						
United Kingdom	1871	19%	United States	1880	49%	New Zealand	1891	35%
	1911	12%		1911	36%		1911	24%

(sources; New Zealand figures from Lloyd Prichard 1970, all other countries from Phelps-Brown & Browne 1968)

In this Century there have been two distinct population trends in New Zealand. These are the Northwards movement of the population and its urbanisation. By 1971 one quarter of the population lived in the Auckland metropolitan area, and 55% in the two Auckland statistical divisions. There has been a continuing reduction in the proportion of the population lving in rural areas, and from 1961 a reduction in the size of that population. This is shown in table 4.

TABLE 4

The rural and urban population of New Zealand

	URBAN		RURAL		
Year	Population	Index	Population	Index	% Rural
1926	937	100	464	100	33.1
1951	1,407	150	527	114	27.3
1961	1,840	196	569	123	23.6
1966	2,119	226	553	119	20.7
1971	2,329	248	529	114	18.5

(source; New Zealand Official Yearbook 1974,p65)

notes

1. The population figures are in '000's.
2. This table uses the Census definition of urban 'the population of the 24 urban areas plus that of all boroughs,town districts,county towns and townships with populations of 1,000 or over.'
3. This is the definition used for the 1971 Census of Population and Dwellings; it is slightly changed from previous dates. The effect of the change is accounted for in the above table.

The size of the rural population reached a peak in 1961, from 1961 to 1971 there was a decline of 7% with the result that the population in 1971 was almost the same as that 20 years earlier. This reduction has occurred because of the spread of towns into adjacent rural areas as well as because of the movement of people. In the period 1966-71 the rural population increased only in rural counties adjacent to cities and in those where there was a developing tourist or retirement centre or where extractive industry developed. A similar situation occurred in small towns of under 5,000 inhabitants; 22 of the 58 such towns decreased in population.

While the national scale of the reduction in the size of the rural population is comparatively recent,there has been continuing net migration from the rural areas to

urban ones. This is shown by the much lower rate of population growth of the rural areas. Although such net migration is a common feature of the developed world, New Zealand is an apparent special case as, until recently, there has not been a substantial decline in the number of people engaged in agriculture. Table 5 shows the number of persons engaged in agriculture at various dates.

TABLE 5

Number of persons engaged in agriculture

Year	Males	Females	Total
1921	118,491	8,127	126,618
1951	119,172	9,506	128,678
1956	116,775	8,917	125,692
1961	111,909	9,732	121,641
1966	110,655	14,493	125,168
1971	101,310	17,962	119,272

(source; Census of Population, various dates)

The information on the size and make-up of the agricultural work-force is somewhat confusing.[i] The information from the population census shows that there was a 15% reduction in the number of males engaged in agriculture in the 20 years 1951-71. This has been partly compensated for by an increase in the number of females, although this may be more apparent than real following changes in taxation provisions. Most certainly, however, the rate of reduction of the agricultural labour force is considerably less than that in other countries such as the United States where the number of persons engaged in agriculture fell from 11.3 million in 1913 to 3.5 million in 1973, (Connor 1974, quoting Monthly Labor Review)

i. Three sources of statistics are available; Lloyd (1974;20-36) discusses the inconsistencies of them. The Census of Agriculture data show an increase in the male farm labour force in the period 1971-73. This is discussed in Gill H. 1976

Views of the 'Rural Problem'

The reduction in the rural population has aroused concern from two directions. Economists see it as a problem leading to a shortage of farm labour and hence a constraint on the development of farm production. This view is highlighted by the Report of the Agricultural Development Conference 1963-4 . On the other hand there are those who see the decline as causing the erosion of the 'rural community' and of a distinct way of life. Probably the most sustained non-economic commentator on rural depopulation is Morton (see for example 'Production or People-What is a Rural Area For ?',1974)

Apart from the subject of concern the two groups share little else. The economic viewpoint pays scant attention to the pattern of rural society,other than searching for means to induce people to stay in agriculture and for farmers to expand production. The non-economic group does not examine the assumptions of a distinct rural way of life or that of some good and homogeneous community that is being destroyed.

It is our opinion that analysis must commence with examination of the features of rural society as it exists, and with the meanings attached to the idea of a 'rural way of life'. Many of the presumed values of 'rurality' seem to have originated outside the economic and social reality of New Zealand rural areas. In this we follow Williams (1975) who argues that 'rural' is concerned not only with a physical and [illegible] entity and population, but also with an image of the good life passed by. In examining rural society in New Zealand cognisence must be paid not only to what it is,but also to who supports a particular image of it,and how this benefits or detracts

from the position of that group.

Sociological models drawn from North American or European Rural Sociology seem to have little direct relevance in understanding the New Zealand situation. The major reason for this is the period of settlement. This came after the agricultural, the industrial and the bourgeois revolutions. As Beaglehole (1936) describes New Zealand, as 'the exemplar of modern capitalist expansion', and as, 'an essay in a single social and economic system'. Yet because of the form of development, the continuation of a colonial rather than an industrial economy, and the high level of state involvement in development and in economic and social affairs, this pattern has taken a substantially different form to that in the 'Old World' and the 'New World'. The 'capitalism' is perhaps most important in terms of Weber's (1946) contrast of the position of the American and European farmer; the former was producing for a market older than himself, the European one for a market younger than himself. In New Zealand it was the market which 'created' the farmer.

Geographical mobility in New Zealand

Emphasis on rural depopulation obscures the fact that the reduction in population is the net effect of substantial movement in both directions between town and country. The New Zealand population has a high level of geographic mobility. Between 1966-71 33% of the population moved residence at least once between statistically delineated areas.[i] In the 12 months before the 1971 Census 14% moved at least once (1971 Census of Population & Dwellings Report 9)

i. This covers movement between urban areas as well as between This includes migration between urban wards as well as between small towns and counties and the urban areas.

Movement between the 24 designated 'urban areas' and rural areas is shown in table 6. Information is not yet available on the extent of movement between rural counties, or between these and the smaller towns. The 24 Urban Areas contain 74% of the total New Zealand population.

TABLE 6

Residential mobility 1966-71 between urban and rural

	from 24 urban areas to rural	from rural to 24 urban areas
males	26,071	36,659
females	24,117	39,559
total	50,188	76,218

(source; N.Z.Department of Statistics 1975)

The net migration of women from rural areas to the 24 urban ones was 15,422; for males it was 10,558. The migration of both sexes from the urban places to rural areas was equivalent to 9.1% of the 1966 rural population; movement in the opposite direction was equivalent to 13.8% of that population. This is a total movement equivalent to 23% of the 1966 rural population. In the same period the rural population decreased by 4.4%.

The reduction in population is thus only a small part of the total movement; within this movement it can be seen that the net loss of females is greater than that of males. Various pieces of information have enabled us to show the selective nature of this pattern of migration. Table 7 summarises our conclusions in regard to migration.

TABLE 7

The major groups involved in rural-urban migration

From rural to urban	From urban to rural
adolescent males	
adolescent females	
	women at marriage
manual & farm workers over 25	manual & farm workers under 25
males & females at retirement	

This classification does not imply that only people with these characteristics migrate between town and country. Rather that it is the positive or negative balance across these groups which is most important in affecting changes in the size of the total rural population. In this way depopulation, and increase in population, differ in degree, not in form. The above groups explain the changes in recent years. At the same time there appear also to be longer term trends; in particular there has been a gradual reduction in the number of independent own-account farmers who are leaving agriculture and, apparently, rural areas.

There is no comprehensive statistical material refering to urban and rural areas and differences can only be obtained by comparing information on a county by county basis. Examination of census data for the Christchurch Urban Area and the adjacent North Canterbury rural counties shows that the proportion of adolescents (15-19 years old) of both sexes is lower in rural than in urban areas. Our estimates are that in 1971 there had been a 20% loss by out-migration of male adolescents and a 70% reduction of females. Similar analysis shows that some 30% of

people over 65 years had migrated from the rural counties. This is confirmed by figures from the 1966 Census which show that the proportion of the urban population over 65 years old was 11.4 % for males and 14.6% for females; in rural areas the proportions were 8.8% and 9.2% respectively.

The movement of women to rural areas at marriage was indicated by analysis of census data. It was confirmed by a national sample survey of rural women which shows that 45% of the women resident in rural areas had moved there from an urban place, and that only 23% were born in a rural area. (Gill T et al 1976)

Some 60% of rural males over 15 years of age are involved in agriculture as farmers or farm workers. Wage and salary earners make up around 40% of male employment in agriculture. In 1971 the median age of male wage and salary earners in agriculture was 26.0 years, a figure which has been virtually unchanged since 1926. Within the static-declining total number of farm workers this can only indicate a replacement of older people by younger, new entrants. Other studies have shown that labour turnover rates in agriculture are as high, if not higher, than those prevailing in industry.

Choice of urban and rural residence

The extent of migration between town and country evidences that the two are considered as alternative locations by many New Zealanders; it is certainly impossible to regard rural depopulation as a one-way process. One of us has previously shown that rural-urban and urban-rural migration can be treated as a choice process (Gill T. 1976) As such it involves the consideration of the objective level

of the advantages and disadvantages of residence in a rural or urban area, and of the subjective image of what 'rural' and 'urban' are. As measured by the conventional indices of social status there are considerable differences between the groups who make up the rural population. These differences are also related to the views held about the very meaning of 'rural life'.

Rural people in New Zealand are not, taken as a whole, deprived relative to the urban ones. In this respect the New Zealand situation appears to deviate from the more general overseas case. On the other hand the differences within the rural population are as least as great, if not greater, than those among urban people. This lack of homogeneity contrasts with classical Gemeinschaft ideal types. This is shown by a summary of our studies on the pattern of social stratification in rural New Zealand. Full documentation of these is provided in the papers listed in the bibliography.

Property ownership

There is little tradition in New Zealand of the separation of land ownership from farm operation. In 1972 48% of agricultural land was freehold, 44.5% held on crown lease or licence, and only 2.5% leased from private landlords. Likewise there has not been a Marxian pattern of increasing capitalistic concentration of the rural means of production. The corporately owned estates of the 1890's were among the first to be sub-divided into private family ownership; similarly as Lloyd (1974) shows there has been little intrusion of 'agri-business' at the property level, even though there has been a reduction in the number of farms and an increase in the average size.

The proportion of independent proprietors in the employed population is four times greater in the countryside than in the towns. However, the continuation of 'family farms'

co-exists with a marked concentration of land and property ownership. In 1972 1,952 farms over 2,000 ha account for 3.1% of all holdings by number but occupy 51.2% of all agricultural land. Because of the very variable intensity of land use it is dangerous to draw too many conclusions on this basis. While information on capital ownership is not available it can be shown that 3.9% of all holdings with sheep own 20% of all sheep, and that the investment of new capital is concentrated on the larger units. Furthermore there is a surprising continuity in the number of very large and very small farm units. For example there were 148 units with over 20,000 acres (8,000 ha) in 1891,203 in 1933, and 198 in 1960.

Occupations

Agriculture still dominates male employment in rural areas of New Zealand. In both urban and rural areas around 55% of the male working population are manual employees (this includes agriculture). The difference between rural and urban areas is the lack of a white-collar sector in the former.

The use of paid labour in agriculture has become slightly more important as a proportion of the total work force, despite a reduction in the number of employees. It seems that the more successful 'own-account' farmers have displaced their less successful fellows and become employers; this is particularly marked after 1951. There is little trend, however, for the own-account farmers to become employees. Instances of formal employer-employee relationships are now more widespread than they were, but there are fewer employees per employer than previously.

Distinctions in the level of income and of property ownership are most extreme in the case of the farmer and the farm worker. In a country where 70% of families own or are

purchasing their own home three-quarters of permanent farm employees live in accomodation provided by their employer. Similarly the median taxable income of farmers is more than twice that of farm employees, and the mean more than 2½ times greater.

Income

Information on incomes relates to taxable incomes which is very inadequate in comparing the self-employed person with the employee. Even so comparison of the Census information for the Canterbury Province in 1971 shows that the mean male income is very similar in urban and rural areas. But, compared to the urban area, there are proportionately more high income earners and proportionately more lower income earners in the rural areas. In other words, there is a greater spread of income level in the countryside than in the town. This is supported by national information which shows in 1966 farmers made up the largest section of high income earners in New Zealand. Similarly in 1971 while 35% of all farmers recorded incomes over $5,000 per annum, only 16% of male earners in New Zealand did so.

In the ten years from 1961-71 the relative income position of rural residents, or more particularly the better off section, has declined . This is a loss of advantage, relative to urban residents, rather than an increase of disadvantage.

Education

The educational level attained by present residents of rural areas compare favourably to that of those resident in the smaller urban centres. In fact, in the rural areas studied the proportion of women with at least secondary school qualifications exceeds that of men.

The available information leads to the conclusion that the geographical variable 'rural' does not, in the New Zealand context, allow distinctive features of social organisation to be presumed. The residents of rural areas do not share a common life situation; the manifest differences in property ownership and other 'objective' status criteria suggest the existence of distinct groups. The view an individual holds of 'rural life', and the type of social action they take, will depend, in part, upon their recognition and their acceptance of these distinctions.

Views of rural life

A sample survey of women resident in the rural counties of North Canterbury shows that substantial congruence exists between the various aspects of social stratification discussed above (Gill T 1976). Convincing links are established between occupation, property ownership and education; a relationship between these and a subjective appraisal of household finances is also shown. These allow two main status groups to be delineated by reference to husband's occupation; the entrepreneurial group of farmers, farm managers, and proprietors of other businesses, and the manual group of farm and other employees.

Proof that such differences are correlated with what members of the community regard as advantaged and disadvanteged groups requires evidence of, either differential access to power, or, of the distribution of prestige which various groups are regarded as having. The survey results show that a slightly higher proportion of the entrepreneurial group than of the manual belong to various voluntary associations . These associations cover a wide range of activities including community work, political parties, sporting and cultural pursuits. Whereas 53% of the manual group who belong to such associations hold no executive positions in them, only 21% of the entrepreneurial group do not. It

is plausible that election to such position is an indirect index of the individual's standing in the population. Furthermore members of these executives will be more influential than others in determining some of the affairs affecting the population. This evidence suggests that the previously enunciated differences in the life situation of the two groups are meaningful to the members of this rural population. The congruence between the various dimensions of status allows the single factor of entrepreneurship to be used as an indicator of wider differences.

It was previously argued that migration between rural and urban areas of New Zealand can be treated as a process of choice involving the appraisal of the advantages and disadvantages of residence in a given type of area. Analysis of the North Canterbury survey information showed the relevance of this in explaining the decisions of respondents regarding their place of residence. The following were the most significant conclusions.

1. The majority of the residents of the rural area were satisfied with their present location and 72% of the respondents prefered it to an alternative urban or rural one.
2. Satisfaction with a rural location increased with distance from towns; those people closest to towns were more likely to prefer another, more rural location, than those already living further away.
3. The preference for rural location was higher among the entrepreneurial group than the manual one.
4. The disadvantages of rural residence were unimportant in deciding the preference for rural residence. Rather the costs of rural residence, relative to an urban alternative, were seen as inevitable and acceptable in terms of the benefits obtained.
5. The perception of the benefits of rural residence varied between the two status groups. The entrepreneurial group emphasised the opportunity for economic independence and the advantages of the natural environment.

The manual group placed most importance on the collective characteristic of 'community spirit'.

6. The view of 'community' differed between these two groups. The entrepreneurial group were concerned with the idea of 'community involvement', the manual group with inter-personal relations and the benefits of association. The former seems more of a concern with community to maintain or enhance prestige vis a vis it.

Significant differences between the two status groups exist; these relate to the preference for rural residence, and to perceived benefits of rural life, and to the meanings attached to community. In particular there is a distinction between the generally individualistic values of the entrepreneurial group and the more collective ones of the manual group.

Conclusion

The evidence presented in this paper raises many issues in regard to the understanding of rural society in New Zealand and to the question of rural depopulation. Of particular interest is how and why the differing meanings attached to rural life arose and how they are maintained. There are two possible reasons for difference in importance attached by the entrepreneurial group to the environment and to economic independence, on the one hand, and by the manual group to friendliness and community spirit, on the other. The first is that the characteristic is not equally available to the two groups. The second is that one group feels it more worthy of regard than does the other group.

The natural environment should be available to all, unless some other factor or factors prevents its enjoyment. Likewise, 'friendliness' must be available to all the population, or most of it, otherwise it cannot exist. Economic independence,

is only available to those who are self-employed. It seems that the differences between the groups are linked to their economic and occupational position.

The simplest explanation is that economic individualism and relative success of the entrepreneurs allows them to enjoy the natural environment. Conversely the lack of these prevents the manual group from doing so. This group then rationalises its position by emphasising the benefits of association with their fellows.

An alternative explanation is that economic independence is incompatible with the more collective, associative life. Social isolation and a degree of physical isolation may be a necessary price for individual economic success in the New Zealand rural setting. In this sense the advantage of the natural environment is a compensation for the lack of association.

We are inclined to the latter explanation. If the environment was regarded as a reward for economic success it is to be expected that the group enjoying this privilege would attempt to restrict the access of others, particularly as their relative economic position declined. The overwhelming freedom of entry to rural areas of New Zealand speaks against this. Second, the advantage of the natural environment does not appear to compensate for a lack of economic success. It is during periods of low incomes that farmers leave the land.

Prestige in the rural community does not follow from the possession of access to the environment, but from success in business, that is in terms of income and wealth. It is this prestige which allows the entrepreneurial group to dominate rural organisations. To the extent to which they are able to influence the attitudes and values of the lower status group they succeed in maintaining their own position. The lack of distinctive and competing rural manual associations, such as trade unions, makes this task easier. In this sense the 'rural community' in New Zealand must be seen more as a form of social control than as a social form.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Connor C. 1974 U.S.Agri-business & world famine. Int. Socialist Rev. 35;20-31

Gill H. & Gill T. 1975 New Zealand Rural Society-a framework for study. N.Z.Agricultural Science 9;60-8

Gill H. 1976 The Farm Labour Situation. Appendix to Minister of Agriculture's Inquiry into the Farm Situation. Wellington

Gill T. 1976 People and Places-Choice of rural and urban residence in New Zealand. M.A. (Soc) Thesis,Univ. of Canterbury

Gill T, Koopman-Boyden P.G., Parr A.R. & Willmott W.E. 1976 The Rural Women of New Zealand-A National Survey (1975). University of Canterbury.

Gould J.D. 1970 The twilight of the estates 1891-1910. Austr Econ Hist Rev 10;1-26

Lloyd D.W. 1974 A Preliminary Review of Rural Social Conditions with Particular Reference to the Manpower Position on Farms. Wellington.Agricultural Production Council

Lloyd-Prichard M. 1970 An Economic History of New Zealand. Auckland.Collins

Morton H.A. 1974 Production or People-what is a rural area for?. Proc Lincoln Farmers Conference, Lincoln College.

Phelps-Brown E.H. & Browne M.H. 1968 A Century of Pay. London.Macmillan

Weber M. 1956 From Max Weber:Essays in Sociology. Translated Gerth H.H. & Mills C.W.. New York. Oxford Univ.Press

Williams R. 1975 The Country and the City. London Paladin.